

REMARKS

Claims 1-65, are pending in this application, of which Claims 1-23, 29-51 and 60-63 are rejected. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of Claims 24-28, 52-59, 64 and 65 and the indication of allowability of the subject matter of Claims 1-23, 29-51 and 60-63.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-23, 29-51 and 60-63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner states that the breadth of the term “short-quasi-unique-identifier (SQUID)” makes the independent claims unclear. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The generation, applicability, functionality and the use of SQUIDs are well described throughout the Specification. As stated in the MPEP, “When the Examiner is satisfied that patentable subject matter is disclosed. . . he or she should allow claims which define the patentable subject matter with a reasonable degree of particularity and distinctions. Some latitude in the manner of expression and the aptness of terms should be permitted even though the claim language is not as precise as the Examiner might desire.” MPEP § 2173.02.

With respect to the Examiner’s question “How are the identifiers quasi-unique?” it is submitted that they are quasi-unique because they might not be unique, but they are similar in role to prior unique identifiers (UIDs). As stated in the specification, at least on page 8, lines 1-3, SQUIDs are not necessarily unique in that two pointers with the same SQUID might not point to the same object. Because SQUIDs are not unique, they can be much shorter than UIDs, while still providing similar functionality. (Specification, p. 4, ll. 17-21).

The Examiner further states that the term “generating a short-quasi-unique-identifier (SQUID)” is not clear from the claims or the specification because it is not clear how to generate such an identifier. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The generation of short-quasi-unique-identifiers is described in the Specification, where it is stated, in particular, that “preferably,

SQUIDs are assigned according to a uniform distribution over some range.” An artisan skilled in the art at the time of the invention would be enabled to create a generator generating numbers in a uniform distribution over some range, for example, by using a simple counting function, randomly, or by a hashing function, as is stated in the Specification at least at page 7, line 22, through page 8, line 4.

The Examiner also questions the length of SQUIDs, stating that “it is not clear what the extent of ‘short’ means. Is short 10 bits or 80 bits?” The applicants point to the Specification, at least at page 4, lines 18-20, where it is discussed that SQUIDs are short as compared to truly unique identifiers. For example, as described in the Background section relative to unique identifiers, “in a large system, at least sixty-four bits would likely be required in order to avoid any expensive garbage collection of UIDs.” (Specification, p. 4, ll. 8-10). By comparison, the SQUIDs may be, for example, from 8 to 16 bits in length. (Specification, p. 7, ll. 23 and 24) The same magnitude of SQUID length values is discussed on page 11, lines 13-19, where it is disclosed that, if SQUIDs are 8 bits long, the hardware required to implement SQUIDs will consist of some simple logic and will not present much of an overhead. Based on these descriptions, an artisan skilled in the art would be enabled to determine the optimal length of SQUIDs for the particular embodiment of the invention. Therefore, the Applicants submit that the language of the specification and the claims is clear and not ambiguous and the rejection should be withdrawn. All claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By *Lubashev*

Lyudmila Lubashev

Registration No. 55,408

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: *5/9/2005*